

A *Mind* 11.
LETTER
OUT OF

The COUNTRY,
To the AUTHOR of
The Managers *Pro* and *Con*,
IN
ANSWER

To his Account of what is said
At *CHILD's* and *TOM's*
In the CASE of
Dr. Sacheverell,
ARTICLE by ARTICLE. *K*

*Hoc fonte derivata clades
In patriam populumq; Hor.*

LONDON, Printed for J. Morphew, near
Stationers-Hall. 1710.

LETTER

OUT OF

THE COUNTRY

To the AUTHOR of

The Managers Pro and Con

IN

ANSWER

To his Account of what is said

At CHILDS and TOWNS

In the CASE of

Dr. Zacher

ARTICLE by ARTICLE

See former editions of the
in former editions of the

LONDON, Printed for J. Johnson, near
St. Martin's Hill, 1770.

P R E F A C E.

IT may perhaps be thought no small Presumption, to undertake the Answering of so celebrated a Piece as *The Managers Pro and Con*: And indeed, who that had such a Design in his Head, would not have trembled to read the following terrible Advertisement at the end of the *Tatler*? There is just publish'd, *The Fourth Edition of the Managers Pro and Con*; or, An Account of what is said at *Child's and Tom's Coffee-houses*, for, and against *Dr. Sacheverell*. This Book is allow'd by Foreigners, as well as Britains, to be the compleatest Answer to whatever has been written in vindication of the Doctrine of Passive-Obedience, and Non-resistance; and thought by some to be unanswerable. Bless me! (thought I) what will become of the Doctor, and the Doctrine? The Tryal's over, and there's no great harm done to either of 'em: but

—Heu! tantis nequicquam erepte periclis.

This invincible Pamphlet comes at last, and crushes 'em both. And yet I was sure I had read it over very carefully, and apprehended nothing so victorious or formidable. Upon sight of this Advertisement, I read it again; and was confirm'd in my Opinion, that the whole Book consists but of 78 Pages in a moderate Octavo: Not a fifth part of them is spent in arguing the Point of Non-resistance; and even where the Author does make a shew of Proving, there is not

a the

P R E F A C E.

the least glimpse of an Argument so much as pretended to be drawn either from Reason, or Scripture. All that is attempted, is to prove something from History, and from our Laws. How well even that is perform'd, we shall see in its proper place. In the mean time, I can't but stand amaz'd to consider what the Whigs mean ! Do they think to over-bear us eternally with downright Lying and Impudence ! in defiance even of common Experience, and of our Senses ? Or is it, that they have been so baffled and confounded of late, that like beaten Cowards, they are forced to have recourse to Bullying, and Railing instead of Fighting ? But this Book has had Four Editions ; and I never doubted but there were Whigs enough in the Kingdom to buy Ten. But it is allow'd to be the compleatest Answer to the Doctrine of Non-resistance, by FOREIGNERS AS WELL AS BRITAINS. There spoke the true Spirit of Whiggism. By Foreigners as well as Britains ! — That is to say, by Republicans abroad, as well as Republicans at home : In one word, by some Dutch Politicians, by Le Clerc, and the other Correspondents of T---l and C---ns. Indeed it is not to be wonder'd, that those who live under a Republick should be Republicans ; for all People, except some of Us Britains, are apt to like their own Government best ; and we are far from thinking it any Reproach to them that they are so. But that Britains should urge the Authority of Foreigners in judging of our own Constitution, can proceed from nothing but their loving Foreign Schemes of Government, better than that of their own Country. I say, in judging of our own Constitution ; for (as I remark'd above) there is not one Word in this Pamphlet concerning the Doctrine of Passive Obedience in general, as it is a Controversy relating either to Reason, or Scripture ;

P R E F A C E.

ture; but all that is said upon it relates to our own Laws, and Constitution in particular; of which Foreigners, forsooth, must be Judges; and which some People would fain have chang'd and new-modell'd, 'till We have a Dutch Government, as well as a Dutch Alliance. The latter we like extreemly well, but desire to have none of the former. It must be confess'd indeed, the Whigs have greatly the advantage of us, by their strict Alliance with Le Clerc, and the Dutch News-writers. No sooner can one of their Books, or Pamphlets peep abroad, whether it be writ against our Civil, or Ecclesiastical Constitution, or both; whether it be against God or his Church, or His Vicegerents, or upon any other Whiggish Subject whatsoever; but presently you have it's Encomium in the Works of some of those Authors. Thus the famous Rights of the Christian Church was celebrated in the Bibliotheque Choisie; and Priestcraft in Perfection (a profligate Pamphlet, which is now prov'd to be the Perfection of Malice, Impudence, and Ignorance) as also this unanswerable Managers Pro and Con were particularly and honourably taken notice of in the Amsterdam Gazette. Tho' after all, I was for my part so far from being terrify'd at this Confederacy, that I laugh'd heartily when I read in the Paper last mention'd, that the Rigid Anglicans continu'd their Addresses about Passive Obedience; though they were pretty much cool'd by a Book entitled, *Les Avocats pour Et contre*, &c. This 'tis to be strong in Foreign Alliances. Behold the Success of C—ns's Negotiations: 'Twas not for nothing, we find, that so able a Minister of the Party resided at that time in Holland. And yet after all this, I have Confidence enough to undertake an Answer to this renown'd Pamphlet. And I assure the Reader, upon my honest Word, 'twas not
the

P R E F A C E.

the difficulty of the Task that binder'd me from doing it much sooner. But because our Author in many places refers to the Tryal of Dr. Sacheverell, I thought it proper to put off my Answer till the Publication of the Tryal. I need not say much to a considerable part of this famous Work, because it is so very trifling and silly, that to refer to it, is to answer it; and one need only lay it before the Eyes of the Reader, to shew the wretched Folly, and Nothingness of it. For the rest, I shall consider it more at large; and upon the whole, after all the Triumphs of our Adversaries upon the Account of this Pamphlet; notwithstanding the Advertisement in the Tatler, and the Dutch Prints declaring in it's favour, I do not altogether despair of proving, that it is entirely made up of Fallacies in Arguing, and Falshoods in Fact, together with some idle Truths, which are nothing at all to the purpose; the whole being season'd with much Malice, and little, or no Wit; and that it's Author has neither the Reasoning of a Scholar, the Breeding of a Gentleman, nor the Charity of a Christian, but that He is a very insignificant Tool of a very insignificant Party.

A

being fully furnished with your exertions, that a good Pen is not
~~the only one that will do the work, but that a good Pen is not~~
~~the only one that will do the work, but that a good Pen is not~~
~~the only one that will do the work, but that a good Pen is not~~
 A
LETTER
Out of the COUNTRY,

To the Author of the
Managers Pro and Con, &c.

SIR,

IN Your Preamble, by way of excuse for Writing, you
 are pleased to tell us; *Since the Doctor has Publish'd
 his Speech; alias, his Seditious Appeal, you wish some
 better Pen, who had heard the excellent Arguments of
 the Managers, had undertaken to have wip'd out the
 impressions that Speech has made on some People; some of
 those People I suppose, (whose Passions are easier moved,
 than their Judgments rightly inform'd;) 'tis for their sole
 Benefit you enter'd into this Dispute. Whether your Pen,
 Dear Sir, heard these Arguments or not, is a matter of too
 much consequence for me to take upon me to determine;
 and whether your Pen has, or any better Pen, who had
 heard 'em, will be able to wipe out those ugly Impressions,
 I find some make a question; but this I hold assuredly, that
 some Pens, though they don't ride triumphantly in a flaming
 and open Chariot to Westminster-Hall, to hear excellent Argu-
 ments, if they be rightly chosen out of a Godly Collection,
 and well filled with Wicked, Malicious and Seditious design-
 ing Ink, may cast black and odious Colours on white Paper,
 and deface if not quite obliterate, its former Beauty. Now*

being fully satisfied with your excuse, that a bad Pen is better than no Pen at all, as all the World has been these Hundred and fifty Years, I must return you Thanks, in the Name of the Gentlemen at Child's, humble Thanks, humble Thanks, with my Hat off, for your good Management in your late Discoveries; that Dr. Sacheverell was impeach'd and found Guilty of a Wicked, Malicious, and Seditious Intention to undermine Her Majesties Government, &c. and that the Crimes charged upon him, were more than High Crimes and Misdemeanors. I must confess before this, I thought, poor unthinking and unlearned Man that I was, that the House of Commons had impeached him of High Crimes and Misdemeanors, contain'd in the four Articles exhibited against him, and said that those Crimes so charg'd upon him, were committed with an evil Intention to undermine the Government, &c. This mistake I was led into by reading the Preamble and the Articles, as many an honest Man might have been; such are the mischievous Consequences of some things appearing in Print, to the Eye of the World: But now 'tis evident, for you have said it, that he was Impeach'd and found Guilty of a criminal Intention, to undermine Her Majesties Government. I suppose too he is Guilty of, whereas his late Majesty King William the Third, of Whereas, Whereas, and Whereas, of several Acts of Parliament too; of one Act, Entituled, An Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and settling the Succession of the Crown, and of an Act for appropriating certain Duties, &c. In short, he's Guilty of the whole Preamble; and when the other Detachment of Noblemen, Gentlemen learned in the Law, and others, by Mr. Postman, or by A. Baldwin, are brought in to your Assistance, 'tis not unreasonable to hope, that he may be Impeach'd and found Guilty of Deal-boards, Green-bay Seats, Woolpacks, with all things to the Tryal in any wise appertaining or belonging. Now for your second Discovery, which you mention only as your Opinion, and some say you borrow'd, though I rather take it to be an Original; That the Doctor's criminal Intention amounts to somewhat more than High Crimes and Misdemeanors; that there I presume must be collected from the Humanity and undeserv'd Mercy of the Lords, and from that which the World does own, and might have seen at midnight any where, between Charing-Cross and the Exchange, that their Chastisements are next to Impunity. Reflecting with my self what might have been alleg'd, tho' by you omitted in maintenance of this Notion, I humbly conceive

conceive this point will be clearly adjusted to your Satisfaction, by supposing, that the Intention of committing any Crime or Villany, is worse than the actual Commission of the Crime intended; and that specially, when the Question is, what degree of Guilt is contracted by an Intention, or by a Commission of an Act; and what Punishment deserv'd, not in the Eye of God, but in that of an Human Court of Judicature which can take no Cognizance, nor admit of any evidence of an evil Intention, but from Overt-Acts, or Overt-Expressions? In one matter more in your Preamble, I must crave leave to dissent from you, the appearance of things to all Men not being the same, not even to the same Man at different times; and that is, that the Doctor's Council, without exception of any, should seem to be Managers for the Pretender. But this difference between us, however great it may seem, I hope may without much difficulty be reconcil'd; for the Quarrel you have with them, I observe to have been as they pass'd by your Door, Triumphantly, Rebelliously attended, &c; and I perceive soon after, when you was a little better acquainted, *they did all fully and plainly own, that in Cases of extream Necessity, an exception of the Doctrine of Non-resistance was to be admitted, and that such was the Case of the Revolution; and you add, what will beyond all Dispute accommodate this matter, that their Justification of the Revolution gives entire Satisfaction to your Conscience, that you perform'd your Duty to your Country in resisting King James*

ARTICLE the First.

BEFORE I enter into the Dispute, Sir, relating to the Articles of Impeachment, I make it my humble Request to you and my Reader, that you'll do me the Favour, and so much Justice, as not to expect from me, who can make no pretences to those Qualifications, that I should contend with you in these points, with that solidity of Learning and depth of Argument, which your Abilities, and the happy opportunity you had of hearing the Excellent Debates at Westminster, give you a just claim to. But, without more Ceremony, I lay this down, that the general Accusation you bring against the Doctor, is, that he affirms, *The Managers of the Commons have supported their Charge by*
Intend-

Intendments, unnecessary Implications, and strain'd Constructions, by piecing broken Sentences, and conjoyning distant and independent Passages, in order to make him speak what he never thought of; and, that this is the Aspersions from which you undertake, and suppose your self able to vindicate the Commons. Now, Sir, I humbly conceive, that, if this his Affirmation be not true, at least in some measure so, there was not that Occasion for the Representatives of the whole Nation of Great Britain, always esteem'd a wise Assembly, at this Juncture especially, to have gone out of the usual Paths, which the Wisdom of our Laws has chalk'd out for the Punishment of Offenders, the common Courts of Justice. And, that the Matters with which he is charg'd, are not so plain as you wou'd represent them to be, and persuade the World they are, is farther evident from the service you suppos'd your self able to do by your Treatise; which I think would not be very great, if you were writing a Book only to tell the World, that the matter you write about was very plain before you wrote. However, Sir, I desire that you'll take along with you this Observation, that we are debating how far you have in the Name of the Gentlemen at Tom's, and not how far those of the House of Commons in their Speeches, have given occasion for, or since wiped out, this Aspersions; and that I don't pretend to intermeddle with the Arguments of the Managers at Westminster-Hall, which I heard not, but with those of the Managers at Tom's, which you have been pleas'd to dispense out to the World. Taking it for granted then, that you don't much rely upon the patience of the Managers in hearing this Language, or their indulgence in acquiescing under his printing it, as proofs of the Injustice of the Language; we proceed to consider how far yours or your Managers Arguments here produc'd do support the Articles exhibited against the Doctor, in maintenance of the Impeachment of High Crimes and Misdemeanors. The first Charge you bring is, That he suggests and maintains, that the necessary means us'd to bring about the late Happy Revolution were odious and unjustifiable; and your proof is from that passage, wherein the Doctor asserts and maintains an Absolute and unconditional Obedience to the Supreme Power in all things lawful, and the utter illegality of Resistance upon any pretence whatsoever. Now, Sir, with Confidence, that in tender Compassion to my many Infirmities, you'll shew me so much Humanity, as to allow me the use of a Syllogism, and that you'll not immediately bring me into the same
 Con-

Condemnation with those *who are but lately come from the Universities, or those many who have lived too long in it*; your Argument, if reduc'd into Syllogism, I think, stands thus. That all Resistance to the supreme Power upon any pretence whatsoever, is illegal, is agreed to be the Doctor's Assertion and Position. Then follows; whatsoever is illegal is odious and unjustifiable; Resistance to the supreme Power is illegal; therefore Resistance to the supreme Power is odious and unjustifiable. Then you go on, and charge the Doctor thus; Resistance to the supreme Power was the necessary means to bring about the Revolution; according to you, Resistance to the supreme Power is odious and unjustifiable; therefore, according to you, the necessary means to bring about the Revolution, were odious and unjustifiable. In maintenance of the first Proposition of the second Syllogism, that Resistance to the supreme Power was the necessary means to bring about the Revolution, out of the abundance of our Treasure you pour in upon us, p. 9. Several Arguments, excellent indeed they are, and learned Arguments, though by the way grounded on Matters of Fact not altogether true, to prove that Resistance was made at the Revolution; but the mischief of it is, *such mischiefs ever do environ the Man that medleth with cold Iron*, they are nothing to the purpose. For if I mistake not, the Doctor is speaking of and maintaining, and is by you charg'd, as speaking of and maintaining, the illegality of Resistance to the supreme Power, and you taking no notice of the Resistance to the supreme Power which he is condemning, tell us a long Story of the Resistance made to the Person of King James, without saying or proving, or pretending to prove, that the supreme Power of the Nation was lodg'd in King James. Now, Sir, to make these Arguments to the purpose, at least furiously so, I conceive 'twill be necessary for us to suppose, either that you don't charge him with maintaining the Doctrine of Non-resistance to the supreme Power, but that of Non-resistance to the Prince; or that you don't undertake to prove that Resistance to the supreme Power was the necessary means to effect the Revolution, only in general that Resistance was. If you charge him with maintaining the Doctrine of Non-resistance to the Person of the Prince, you charge him with more than the Gentlemen of the *House of Commons* have done, and with that which I'll take upon me positively to say, you can't prove him to have done in his Sermon or Speech, otherwise than by Intendment, unnecessary Implication, or some strain'd Construction. And if you don't undertake to prove that Resistance to the supreme Power was the necessary means to effect the Revolution, then you must give me leave to say, that

all. that you have hardly learn'd of Mr. Bickerstaffe, to ingage
 shadows of your own chalking out on the World, for there's
 not so much as an appearance in the Doctor's Assertions of
 any Non-resistance, but of that to the Supreme; and you
 are engaging, pushing, running through, and murdering
 Non-resistance to the Prince. And you are so Civil, after
 a decent Interspersion of scandal on the Doctor's Understand-
 ing, for fear of being Guilty of too much Civility, as to
 make out this your self; for in p. 7. you charge him with
*Art and Caution in leaving the supreme Power indefinite, and
 at large, and (as you add) so that he may fix it where he
 pleases on Occasion.* If the Doctor was artful and cautious in
 this, I can't but think that he observ'd with pleasure and
 comfort to himself, though he had not the Vanity to pub-
 lish it to the World, that he was not more artful and cauti-
 ous (whether with less reason I leave to your Determinati-
 on) than our Saviour was, when the Pharisees ask'd him,
 if 'twere lawful to give Tribute unto *Cesar* or not: For he
 putting to them the Question, *Where is the Image and Su-
 perscription of the Tribute Money?* which in their Appre-
 hension was putting it upon them to say, what was the
 Constitution of their Government, and where the supreme
 Power lodg'd; upon their Answer, that it was *Cesar's*, makes
 this Inference, and teaches this Doctrine in general Terms;
Render therefore unto Cesar, the things that are Cesar. Soon
 after you are got into another strain, which by the way you
 don't continue long in, for a very good Reason, and tell us,
*That the Doctor avows in his Speech, that he preach'd the Do-
 ctrine of Non-resistance in the full Latitude, that the Fathers
 Dead and Living taught it;* to which I hope 'twill be time
 enough to Answer, when you shall have oblig'd the World
 by pointing out the passage wherein he avows this; for I
 profess, I don't find it in the printed Editions of his Speech,
 and an Infallible Manuscript I have nor. I think he does
 somewhere say, that he express'd this Doctrine in the same
 general Terms, in which he found it deliver'd by the Apo-
 stles of Christ; if so, he has done no more than what an
 Author whom you cite with Approbation, p. 16. says, the
 Laws of Religion in Scripture have done; that is, esta-
 blish'd the several Constitutions and Governments in the
 World: And then I'm sure, the Doctrine by him preach'd,
 whatever Terms he us'd; is as good and true Doctrine at
Amsterdam or London, as 'tis at *Paris or Moscow.* The
 Doctor says farther, that he us'd no other Language than
 what has been us'd by our first Reformers, by a continued
 Series of Right Reverend Prelates, and other celebrated Di-
 vines now with God, and by many of those Venerable Ea-
 thers

thers before whom he stood, and what is perfectly agreeable to the Laws and Statutes of the Realm. Now if any of those Divines in preaching the Doctrine of Non-resistance, have taken upon 'em to discuss and determine where the Sovereign Power of this Nation is lodg'd, in doing which I'm sure you think they exceeded their Province and deserved an Halter; I conceive he'll hardly deserve an Eternal and Indelible Brand of Infamy to be fix'd upon him in a Parliamentary way, only because in preaching the Doctrine he left the other point to the discussion and determination of the Laws of the Land, and of the Parliament. In his Speech he tells us, and I believe you'll hardly deny it, that in his Sermon he don't apply the Doctrine of Non-resistance to the Revolution; and adds, as a Reason and a proof that he did not apply it, that 'tis not applicable to the Revolution, the Supreme Power being then not resisted: And I must, and do insist upon it, that whatsoever your private Opinion is, or that of every individual Man in the Kingdom, or indeed whatever the Truth of the Matter is, yet if his Opinion be (whatsoever that Opinion arises from) that there was no Resistance to the Supreme Power at the Revolution, though he reflects never so severely and often on Resistance to the Supreme Power, I insist that he can't be guilty of intending or meaning to blacken or revile the Revolution by those Reflexions. And if there be Persons that can think it reasonable in a publick, solemn and extraordinary manner, to prosecute a Man for a singular Notion, if it be a singular one, that there was no Resistance to the Supreme Power at the Revolution; if some Persons can think that such a Person *should be drawn to his Trial in a Sledge*, and others that he shou'd be banish'd, even hang'd, drawn and quarter'd, for thus offending, some will be apt to conclude that there are those People in the World who only occasionally admire and practise the Christian Vertue of Moderation. The next thing you attempt is, to destroy the Arguments which the Doctor alleges in Defence of this Doctrine of Passive-Obedience: But before we enter into that Debate, I shou'd be extremely oblig'd to any one who cou'd give me a little Satisfaction in these Two Points: How this Controversy, which way soever determin'd, is to your Purpose? And how it becomes, it being grown Matter of equal Wonder on both Sides, now to be reviv'd? I suppose, Sir, for I can do no more than suppose, till some Acts of Parliament are expressly as well as virtually repeal'd, that if 'tis to the Purpose, 'tis because there's no

B

Law,

Law, Statute, or Gospel, against the Doctrine of Non-resistance, which is the most that your whole Book on that Head, together with your Appendix, pretends to prove; from whence, and because the Clergy are to be (but at the Time of those Sermons preaching were not) directed what Doctrines they are to preach, and what not, it most evidently follows, that a Man is guilty of High Crimes and Misdemeanors, add to them Rebellion and High-Treason, for preaching that, against which, one time or other, there may possibly be Laws, Statutes, and Gospel, tho' there be none at present existing. I ask your Pardon, Sir, for the Freedom I took in affirming that you don't pretend to prove that Non-Resistance is against Law, Statute, and Gospel, for upon closer Examination I perceive you assert what comes pretty near it, That Resistance in some Cases is an indispensable Duty, and this you prove by some demonstrative Arguments, the Acts of Parliament made to prevent vexatious Suits against those that acted in order to the Revolution, and for the Indemnification of those that did so act; that is, I suppose, to prevent vexatious Suits against and to indemnify those that did their indispensable Duty. Upon which I observe, That if Resistance in some Cases be a necessary Duty, which is widely different from its being barely lawful, then a Man is oblig'd in Conscience always to consider and look out sharply when those Cases happen, in order to inform himself when the Duty incumbent may be put in practice; for an indispensable Duty you know can't be put in practice too often. Now the Persons that are concern'd in the Commission of the Crimes of Treason and Rebellion, or rather of those Acts to which such Appellations are commonly impos'd by Governments, will tell you, if you'll give 'em the hearing, that they consider'd the Case, they inform'd themselves of their Duty, as far as their Capacities and Knowledge extended, and that according to the best Light they could gain, and in their Apprehension they were attempting to do their Duty; notwithstanding which Plea it commonly so happens that they are hang'd, drawn and quarter'd, I suppose, for not being so quick and happy in their Apprehensions as wiser and honest Men are. But how comes this Controversy to be now reviv'd? I think, Sir, you allow that the Cases wherein Tyrants are to be depos'd are unfortunate Cases, p. 11. That upon such and such Misdemeanors the Subjects are absolv'd from their Allegiance, p. 13. That you are indispensably oblig'd to resist the unlawful Acts of a Tyrant, p. 16. And you tell us, p. 18. *That our beloved Queen*
reigns

reigns in the very Souls of all Her People, except **SACHEVERELL** and Company; from whence I infer, That Sermons and Books about the Measure of Submission to the Supream Power (drawn by **HOADLY** and Company, payable by **Sacheverell** and Company) have been absolutely necessary all this Queen's Reign. On the other side you inform us that Doctor **Sacheverell** allows the **DEFACTOSHIP** (as you call it) of the Queen, and asserts the Queen's Title to the Crown to be an Hereditary Right devolv'd upon Her from Her Royal Ancestors, p. 21. Add to this, what I'm sure you'll allow, that reviling the present Stablistment and Possession in the Queen, is reviling the Succession in the House of *Hanover*, and I'm sure you'll grant, that if the Queen now in Possession (where God long preserve Her) and those under the present Stablistment that are next to come in Possession, are never resisted, they'll never lose their just Right and Interest; and then the Consequence is plain, that in order to depose the Queen and the Family of *Hanover*, the Doctrine of Non-resistance is absolutely necessary, and a wholsom Doctrine for these Men and these Times. Now let us examine your Answers to the Doctor's Arguments for Non-resistance; the first of which he draws from the Homilies, as teaching this Doctrine in most expresse Terms, which Homilies he says were stablist'd by the Thirty Nine Articles, these Articles were confirm'd by the Thirteenth of **QUEEN ELIZABETH**, and that Act is made perpetual by the Act of Union. The Answer you make, which I collect from your Postscript, stands thus: The Articles confirm'd by Law are *all the Articles of Religion which only concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, compriz'd in a Book imprinted entitl'd, Articles whereupon it was agreed by the Archbishops and Bishops and the whole Clergy in the Convocation holden in London in 1562, &c.* which Words you say confirm only those Articles which can be reduc'd to those Two Heads, viz. *Articles that concern only the Confession of the true Christian Faith and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, and exclude all others which fall not under those Heads.* I suppose, Sir, you did not design that your long Argument in your Reflexions on a Book entitl'd, *Priestcraft in Perfection*, added by way of Postscript, which was to be a full Answer to all the Speeches that have been made for the Doctor, should be involv'd in a general Answer to your Book; that, I presume, you would have reserv'd for the Benefit of the Clergy only, that you may have an Opportunity of shewing how far you exceed *the Great South, the Learned Smalridge, and the*

Divine Pen of Atterbury. In Confidence that some of the Gentlemen of that Robe will clear up this Matter, and do you Justice on that Subject, I shall propose only a Query or Two, one of which I recommend to you and your friend the Author of *Priestcraft in Perfection*, and when those are plainly and directly answer'd, I may, tho' I can't pretend to be so much concern'd for Truth rather than my own Opinion as your dear self, be convinc'd of the Truth of your Assertion. If the Act of Parliament confirms all the Articles of Religion with this Description of 'em, Articles which only concern the Confession, &c. Articles compriz'd in a Book entitled, *Articles agreed upon, &c. in 1662, &c.* and if all the Thirty-Nine Articles (one Clause in one Article at most excepted) are compriz'd in that imprinted Book, and if all the Articles now contended about were then agreed upon, which no Body will deny, then *quære* whether that additional Description, Articles which only concern the true Confession, &c. be a true Description of the Articles confirm'd? If not a true one, which I humbly conceive you admit, contending that some of 'em are Articles of Discipline, then *quære* whether that additional Description be surplusage only, and then all are confirm'd, or, which is much more comfortable Doctrine in these Times, don't make void and of none Effect the whole Clause of Confirmation in the Act of Parliament? But if that Parliament did intend to confirm only those Articles of Religion which concern the Confession of the true Christian Faith and the Doctrine of the Sacraments, exclusive of all others, then *quære* whether 'tis not reasonable to presume that the Gentlemen who made the Act, whom we both suppose knew how to express themselves accurately, wou'd have worded the Act thus: "The Articles of Religion on only which concern the Confession, &c. or the Articles of Religion, and those only, which concern, &c. instead of and rather than all the Articles of Religion which only concern? Lastly, If the Homilies, as the Preamble of the Article stablishing 'em recites, do contain a godly and wholsom Doctrine, and are to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood by the People; and if the Rubrick of the Office for the Thirtieth of January, and of that for the Fifth of November, appointed before and confirm'd since the Revolution, directs, *That after the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall be read one of the Six Homilies against Rebellion*, *quære* whether the Article relating to the Homilies don't concern or might by that Parliament be understood to concern the Confession of the true

true Christian Faith? The Homilies then being not stablish'd by Law, you consider 'em only *as so many Sermons wrote by the Clergy in Edward the Sixth's Days, when few of them were of tolerable Learning or Abilities:* but it happens a little unluckily I confefs, the Homilies referr'd to and enumerated in the Article were made in Queen *Elizabeth's Days:* however that's no great Matter, for I suppose those in her Days had not much more Learning or Abilities, only to write a Homily or Two now and then, or so; and yet notwithstanding your mean Opinion of the Compilers of these Sermons, and of the Members of this Convocation, if I mistake not your meaning, you are labouring to make 'em speak your Sense, or one not inconsistent with your Sense, of this Doctrine, not in order to prove any thing from thence, I suppose, but that Men of small Learning and Abilities might be all of one Mind; and p. 11. you tell us, That for some wise Reasons, I think because Queen *Elizabeth* supported the *Hugonots* and the *Dutch* against their tyrannical Kings, *'tis improbable they should ever think Resistance de toto genere unlawful;* and I perceive, p. 18. that you are in great Pleasure, and that 'tis exceeding comfortable to you to find that the Doctrine of Non-resistance, as now preach'd (by the Doctor you mean, or should mean) is not the Sense of the Homilies. For a Secret you tell the Doctor somewhere, I'll tell you one, That you might have prov'd that the Doctor himself preach'd the Doctrine in the Sense you understand it, and that too with half the Labour and a quarter of the Reason which you have employ'd to prove the Clergy at the Reformation understood it in the Sense you do; but with what Pleasure or Comfort you had done this, I doubt must remain a Secret. As for the Doctor's next Argument for Non-resistance, the concurrent Opinion of the most Able and Orthodox Divines down from the Reformation to this Day, that there I find we are not likely to controvert much, for you only repeat his Words, *That he thinks his Case extream hard that he should be accus'd for what others have receiv'd Thanks;* add to this, what you add, that for which others have been made Bishops, and add what the Doctor adds, have receiv'd Thanks from this very House of Commons, and those Thanks convey'd by some of the Managers themselves, then surely we shan't disagree that his Case was extream hard. Another Thing which the Doctor's Managers insist on is, the Clause in the Militia Act 13 of *Charles II.* *That both, or either Houses of Parliament, may not lawfully raise or levy War, offensive or defensive, against His Majesty;* and

and observe that the same Parliament in another Sessions by the Corporation Act enjoyn'd a declaratory Oath, *That it was not lawful on any Pretence whatsoever to take Arms against the King.* Your Answer is, The Clause in the Militia Act and the Oath in the Corporation Act, are Positions convertible, but the Act stablishing the Oath is repeal'd; that is, the second Act, which adds the Strength of an Oath to the first, is taken away, and the first Act is left in *statu quo*; the Consequence I don't doubt all Mankind sees, therefore the first Act is virtually not only but expressly repeal'd. But for fear this should not effectually do the Business, which you seem to be suspicious of, but without Reason, if it has done it expressly, you draw in the Act of Rights and Liberties, 1 *William and Mary*, and tell us that has damn'd the Substance and Intention of the Militia Act. I suppose, Sir, one may be at Liberty, without incurring the Guilt of high Crimes and Misdemeanors, to say, That the Queen's Majesty is one part of the Constitution of *Great-Britain*, as well as that the Two Houses of Lords and Commons are a part, and that 'tis equally true that the whole is subverted if the Monarchy be, as 'tis that the whole is if the Two Houses of Parliament are; and I think you inform us that the Militia Act was made only to condemn Antimonarchical Principles, (which by the way you have now expressly repeal'd) and that the Makers of that Act, who design'd it only for the Preservation of one part of the Constitution, *viz.* the Monarchy, would be astonish'd to see that very Act stretch'd to the Subversion of the whole; yes, most certainly, and I'm sure you'll grant that the Act of Rights and Liberties was design'd only to declare and secure the Interest and Privileges of Parliaments and the Subjects, therefore the Makers of this Act too might be astonish'd to see an Act made for the Preservation of one part of the Constitution, *viz.* the Parliament, stretch'd to the Subversion of the whole; nay, with greater Reason might the Makers of this Act be astonish'd; for the Act of Rights and Liberties stands in full Force and Vigour unrepeal'd, nay, unattempted, so capable of being us'd to an ill Purpose; whereas the Militia Act, made for the Defence of Monarchy, is virtually and expressly repeal'd, nay, the Substance and Intention of it is damn'd and confounded, the Consequence is ——— Now, Sir, for your Original Contract, which, how much soever others may have ridicul'd by importunately desiring to see it, I perceive some have the Confidence to say you have much more ridicul'd by the good Account you have given of it, and

and for your own and their Sakes importunately desire of you never more to give a good Account of Original Contracts, specially unless it be more to the Purpose than this is, of which more afterwards.

They say your Account is, *That we must not expect to see an Original Contract in Writing, because Time must needs have worn that out, and 'tis lively 'twas only verbal; and they grant, it seems, that if 'twas only verbal, they are not to expect to see it in Writing: But I can't persuade 'em that they understand how it comes to be worn out, if it never existed, which is suppos'd, if 'twas only verbal, or how it came to be verbal only, if ever it existed, which they affirm it did once, if 'twere capable of being worn out. In short, they are fully satisfy'd that you can't shew it them: Then I told 'em, That if the first Records of Authority mention it; if former Kings have confirm'd it in Parliament; if the Opinions of all ancient Lawyers agree in it, and the People ever since have enjoyn'd and maintain'd it, 'tis something more than a Fable; to which they readily assented, and immediately appointed Time and Place of meeting to examine these Records. Accordingly at the Time and Place I produc'd Lambard, which, without any Cavil or Exception, they allow'd to be the first Records of Authority, and I read out of him Two whole Sentences, p. 142. *Rex ad hoc est constitutus ut Regnum & Ecclesiam ab injurijs defendat, quod nisi fecerit, nec nomen Regis in eo constabit, verum nomen Regis perdit; debet Justitia magis regnare quam prava voluntas.* And turther, *Rex eris dum bene Regis, quod nisi feceris nomen Regis perdis.* Without much Hesitation, Sir, they joyn'd with you in your first Observation, *That the excellent Duties of the King are enumerated, and the Purposes specify'd for which he was made; but told me withal, contending much, That Old Paul's and Peter's Writings (though not Records) were as good and valuable as Mr. Lambard's, and something more ancient; that they had made Three Months before the same Observation on their Description of the Duties of a King, without finding any coercive Clause in 'em. Rulers are not a Terror to good Works, but to Evil: Ministers of God to Man for Good: Revengers**

vengers to execute Wrath upon them that do Evil :
Ordain'd for the Punishment of Evil-doers, and for the
Praise of them that do well.

About your second Observation, *That in the beginning (a Thousand or Two of Years after it begun they suppose you meant) there was a Limitation set on his Power, that he should rule by Law, and not by wicked Will.* After some small Debate, we agreed, That he was not to govern by wicked Will. But I should tell you, Sir, that they insisted on it, that Mr. Lambard has not appointed who shall be Judges, and take an Account when he governs by wicked Will, and that there's some Difficulty for any but God alone to know when a King's Will is a wicked Will; so I was forc'd to comply with 'em, That he's accountable for that to God only, and his own Conscience. I own, that if a Prince in Possession runs away, and deserts or abdicates his Kingdom, and don't or can't protect his Subjects, all which are Matters of Fact, visible by every common Eye, when they happen, and cognizable before the Conscience of every such a Prince's Subjects; in such Cases those Subjects must be at Liberty to admit of, and submit to, another Person, who will protect both Church and State from their respective Enemies.

After all, Sir, I find these Gentlemen are of Opinion, That whatever Limitations were impos'd on, or granted by the Crown in *Edward the Confessor's Days*, or those of *Old Brutus*, by any Contract, whether verbal or writtē, were totally destroy'd and lost by the Conquest of *William the First*; which they tell me was the Sense of our late gracious Sovereign King *William the Third*, who in his Declaration tells the Nation, *It is not to be imagin'd, that either those who have invited us, or those who are already come in, to assist us, can join in a wicked Attempt of Conquest, to make void their own lawful Titles to their Honour'd Estates, and Interests*; and the same was the Sense of the Parliament, when they condemn'd to the Flames the B O O K that pretended to set up the

the Title of Conquest in his late Majesty. I told 'em indeed, *That the Conqueror submitted to wear the Crown on the same Conditions, that his Predecessors enjoy'd it*; which they allow may possibly be true, because it remains still to be prov'd, that either they or he enjoy'd it on any Conditions, that implied a Coercion or Deposition; and insist, that if they his Predecessors, did hold it on any such Tenure, 'twill lye upon you to prove, that such a conditional Tenure was renew'd at the Conquest, for a Reason before given, to which I desire the Favour of an Answer from you by the first Opportunity. The second Argument you urge for proof of this original Contract, is the Confirmation of it by former Kings in Parliament; and for this produce the Charter, or the commonly supposed Charter of King *John*, at *Running Mead*. I shou'd acquaint you, Sir, that some Gentlemen take it much amiss from your Hands, that you should talk of a Confirmation by former Kings, and produce that of one King only, specially having it in your Power to have added by way of Appendix, twenty that prove as much as that does; and which is worse, to prove a power in the People to dethrone and depose their King, granted or confirmed to 'em by Parliament, you give them a Charter impowring the Barons and Commonalty to distress King *John* by all the means they can, viz. by seizing his Castles, Lands, &c. with a Salvo to his own Person, the Person of his Queen, and the Person's of his Children; that is, I suppose, Salvo all Dethronation, Deposition, or Murder of him and his. But what is worse still and worse, and is the most killing thing of all, is your Appendix on this Head. Now for your Continuations, Addenda's, Supplements, Postscripts, or any such like things, those by Christian Fortitude might have been bore; but to reterr the Examination of so weighty a Matter to an Appendix, and then to load that with so many Observations, Deductions, and Corollaries, that there is such an After-clap as enters into the very Bones and Marrow of a Man. But now on your third Head, the Opinions of all ancient Lawyers, I think there you have an advantage by the concurrent Judgment of *Bracton*, *Fleta*, (*Anglice* a Goal-bird) and Chancellor *Fortescue*, whom you pronounce to be the most learned and best of our Chancellors, *except the present*, (there indeed your touch is fine,) and who is Ancient enough in one respect, and in another enough Modern; that is, Ancient enough not to be Modern, and Modern enough not to be Ancient. Well then, be he Ancient and Modern, or

Modern and Ancient, which is most agreeable to your taste, or your purpose ; Chancellor *Fortescue* (in whom together with Mr. *Bracton* and *Fleta*, are included all the Lawyers, and Law from the Days of *Brutus* down to his) affirms, that the Kings of *England* were made by, and receiv'd their power from the People, but I don't find he affirms, there was an original Contract ; however it may do as well if it follows from thence, that there was such a Contract between 'em, reserving a Right in the People to remove him for Tyranny. If 'twere to the purpose, and occasion for it, I cou'd produce the Judgment of ancient Lawyers in great abundance, (about their Wisdom and Learning indeed, when compar'd with that of your Favourites, I doubt we should disagree,) who don't think our Kings derived their Power and Authority from the same Fountain, that you and your Authors do ; but granting it to be so, that the People gave the King his Crown, how does it follow from thence, that they gave it on Condition ? I don't perceive *Fortescue* makes that inference ; but I suppose 'tis because when the People were in giving Humor, they might, if they so pleased, have given it him absolutely without any reserve ; and because, for ought yet appears, they did give it him without any. I know you'll be apt to say, that if they did not insist on such a Bargain or Stipulation, that if the King did not Reign well, that is, so as to please them, for they must be Judges, whether he Reigns well or not, then they were a parcel of Fools and Slaves : But I know some Men who are as wise as your self (with Submission be it spoken) and not at all fonder of Slavery than others, that think a Prince who wou'd take a Kingdom on such Terms, not Guilty of much Wisdom, nor the People who wou'd give it over prudent or politick. If indeed a Prince at his Election does promise, or afterwards out of his good Will and Grace, does grant his Subjects any Liberties or Privileges ; suppose for instance, that no Taxes or Levies shall be laid or impos'd on their Estates, without their consent, or the consent of some by them deputed ; then *quoad hoc*, the Subjects, or those that represent 'em, are let into a share of the Legislature, and so far forth as those precedent Promises, or subsequent Grants do extend, they are become a part of the Sovereign Power of that Nation ; and then we are manifestly got beside the Question ; for the supreme Power of a Nation wherever 'tis lodg'd, whether in one or five Hundred, or in one and five Hundred, is not to be resisted. Of your fourth and last proof of an original

original Contract, viz. the Enjoyment and Maintenance of it by the People, ever since the Foundation of the *English* Government, I don't find you take any other notice, than to repeat your Assertion at the close of the Argument, with this Addition only ; *That the People have exercis'd the Right of dethroning their Kings convey'd by this Contract, whenever the necessity of the Case required it.* In this point (which indeed is a tender one) I think you have acted the part of a prudent Man, though you may have been deficient in that of a disputant ; so then, without raking into Stories, that may be to some persons ungrateful, and not much edifying to any, I shall conclude this Head about the original Contract, submitting it to the Judgment of the Reader, who must and will be judge in the Case ; whether the Authority of Mr. *Lambard*, who made a small Collection of some ancient Pieces, which are so defective, as not even to mention any Contract at all ; so far are they from mentioning one with a Clause of Coercion, together with the Charter granted by King *John*, with an express saving of his Person in it, and the Opinions of three Lawyers, who have exalted the power of the People, so far and no farther, than to fix in them the first Election of the King ; whether this evidence, considering what has been alleg'd to invalidate it, be sufficient to prove, that there was an original Contract made at the stablishing the Government, to depose and dethrone the King's of *England*, whenever there shou'd be a necessity ; that is, whenever the Subjects shou'd think there was a necessity, and that that Charter, notwithstanding the Conquest, and frequent Alterations and Variations in the Constitutions of this Nation, is still in Force. After all, this Charter, if 'twere produc'd, or were never so well prov'd, might be nothing to your purpose ; for it don't follow that, because there was Contract, therefore it was a Contract to retain in the People, a power to depose their Kings ; but I suppose, because we neither of us know what there is in it, we are equally at Liberty to argue what we will into it. For my own part, I'm of Opinion, and have almost Vanity enough to think I'm not singular in it, that 'tis more probable, that this same Contract, if ever it existed, contain'd a promise or a donation of some of those Liberties and Privileges which our Parliament now claims ; and I'm sure that the Arguments, every one of 'em which you allege to prove, that it contains a grant of a Coercive power to the People ; do prove much more strongly, that it contains the Donation I suggest. For your an-

cient Records, I suppose, I might bring about ten Thousand to your one, and the proportion of Lawyers of that Opinion is not much less; and these Rights of Parliament have been so frequently confirm'd by former Kings, and the enjoyment of 'em by the People, has been so constant and uninterrupted for many Ages, that these might have their beginning at the Foundation of our Government, or so soon as it was modell'd into a regular and uniform Constitution. And if these Franchises were the Contents of this Charter, or if by any other ways and means they have been since granted by the Crown to the People, which are such Grants as the one might Justifiably make, and the other Justifiably take; then the Subjects sitting in Parliament by Virtue of those Franchises, so far as they give 'em Authority, are admitted into a part of the Legislative, that is, the supreme power of the State; so your long Harangue about an original Contract becomes nothing to the purpose; for the Question between us is, not whether you have prov'd where the supreme power of this Nation is lodg'd, but whether the supreme power, wherever lodg'd, may lawfully be resisted. After this, I think, you have little in Justification of Resistance, except only a Precedent from the History of the *Jews*; to which I shall need only to say, that when you and your Managers are agreed, whether that the Jewish Government be a proper Authority, from whence to quote a Precedent in this dispute, you may possibly receive more Satisfaction; for if I remember right, *David* said of his Predecessor *Saul*, when he had it in his power to have killed him, *God forbid, that I should stretch forth my Hand against the Lord's Anointed*. At the close of all you are for raising *St. Paul* from the Dead; who when he was alive, preached the Doctrine of Subjection by every Soul to the Higher Powers, that the powers that then were (the *Nero's* and the like) though Unchristian powers, were ordained of God; And that those who resisted the Powers so ordained, would receive to themselves Damnation; but if he were to rise in these our Days, he wou'd certainly come with Grief in one Hand, for the Faults and Miscarriages of some modern Princes, and into the other you shall ev'n put what you please. What you add on the first Article, is only a little something by way of scandal, or so very liberally dispens'd on the Doctor, and those you call his Managers. In the List of these I perceive, Sir, is a large *Posse*; in the first place there's the Doctor's Council; then come *Nonjurors*, *Jacobites*, and *Papists*; after that, in p. 25. he's associated with *Jacobites*, *Papists*, *Furing*, *Non-juring*,

*jur*ing, and such *abjuring* Clergy, that is, with all the Clergy of the Kingdom ; but the most remarkable Managers are in p. 19. and 20. those who were for an Administration and Regency, whether Dead or Alive ; those who distressed King *William* into the Partition Treaty ; and specially you Gentlemen, that were against the Union, and are now become zealous maintainers of it, you to a Man, for your Noses are all told. Add to these, if they are not included under the other Denominations, the two and fifty *not Guilty Lord's*, and those that saved him from a very mild and merciful Punishment, as a certain incomparable Bishop called it ; and all you good people of the Land, wheresoever dispers'd, in *Cheapside* or *Wapping*, in *City* or *Suburbs*, *Town* or *Country*, that in any respect favoured the Doctor, you are under Censure and Condemnation. For you Gentlemen, all of you, p. 20. are close united, and almost under Arms to defend this unknown and worthless Man ; booted and spurred, I suppose, to prove Resistance unlawful, by making Resistance ; and, p. 18. you the same Knot are bringing Arguments against the Revolution, and say, that you are proud of the part you acted in it, and yet think it was Rebellion, because you should have been hang'd if it had not succeeded. Here I doubt I must leave the good Company, of which I guess you'll do me the Honour to suppose me one ; for it was my misfortune not to have then that happy opportunity, which you had of performing my Duty to my Country in resisting King *James*, the part I acted then being too small to be proud of. But with your leave, Sir, I think there are Enemies enough already from one quarter, or other to Her Sacred Majesties Person and Government, and the Protestant Stablishment, without your raising fresh Objections ; and for you, who are so pleas'd and easie under Her Majesties Administration, and so solicitous to confirm the *Hanover Succession* ; for you to start such new and unheard of difficulties ; for you to rack your Brain to invent, and then produce such magnificent Arguments against the Revolution ; this, Sir, I must needs say, from an old and a bosom Friend, is intolerable. In the next Sentence, p. 28. you tell us, that it seems strange to you, that Gentlemen should value themselves for being Rebels ; and you wish that some of 'em don't really think, that they deserv'd to be hang'd for the part they acted. Now, Sir, I confess I have heard, that some persons have done, and valued themselves for doing those things, for which others have thought they deserv'd to be hang'd, and such for which they have themselves

selves thought they should be hang'd, if they were apprehended ; but it does indeed seem strange, that any Man should value himself for doing that for which he thinks himself he deserves to be hang'd ; and were it not that you seem inclinable to be fearful of strange things, some people wou'd be apt to think it strange, that you should wish against and be afraid, that there are any such Gentlemen. The next strange thing which you are fearful of, is a foreign Education of the Youth of *England* ; and the Reason of your fear is, from an handful of Dirt, which you have thrown on our Universities at Home, of which, if taken up in good plenty, you know some drops through the Fingers of the thrower for his own Benefit, and some will stick on the design'd Object ; which I suppose you do out of a tender regard to the Young Gentry of this Kingdom, and out of pure love and kindness to our old Mother *Cambridge*, and her Sister *Oxford*. You tell us, *This rank Weed (of Non-resistance) has over-spread, and is deeply rooted in the Universities* : Alas, Sir, I always said, and so did the old Gentleman before me, the worst Weeds always grow the fastest ; and these Nurseries are become downright *Nurseries of Parties, Factions, and Jacobitism*, and ever since you and I came away, of all false Doctrine, Heresy, and Schism ; and if the Parliament don't take some care, besides burning their Decrees, to prune 'em and lop off their rotten Members, and their more rotten Estates, they'll speedily be left quite desolate ; the whole stock of young Gentry and Clergy Saplings, will transplant themselves immediately to *Utrecht* or *Geneva*. You can't without Ingratitude leave this Head, without a modest Flourish on your friendly Assistant and Fellow-labourer, in the cause, Mr. *Hoadly* ; he, to his immortal Honour, has incurred the Malice of the whole Party, and been recommended by the Parliament to the Queen ; and I suppose, you expect he shou'd do you the Justice of the same Compliment, which no doubt he will, when he has a proper Opportunity. And the like returns you may certainly promise your self, for the abundance of your Civility to Mr. *Dean*, whom you bring upon the Stage, p. 22. only for the service of your Friend, Mr. *Hoadly*, to shew the World how Artificially he, and you from him, can misunderstand, and then apply whatever falls into your Hands on the Subject of Resistance. In, p. 18. indeed you speak something like ; there's Mr. *Dean* not contented to instill this poisonous Doctrine into the Ears of most of the Congregations in Town, but projecting to spread it universally, took an oppor-

opportunity to harangue the whole Clergy of London together ;
 that he, who in his whole Life-time hardly ever preach'd
 to half the Congregations in Town, should in the space of
 a Twelve Month or thereabouts, throw this Poison about
 the Ears of most of 'em, that I perceive (though somewhat
 marvellous) is scarcely to be endured even by one, whose
 Ears it hardly reach'd ; but that he should Preach and
 Print a Latin Sermon, to the utter poisoning all the Plumbs
 and Tobacco in Town ; and that for the spreading it uni-
 versally, he should do this to the whole Clergy of London
 together : Gowns and Cassocks, I suppose, can't be infected
 by any thing less than Latin ; and that in his Dedication,
 he should give them their Cue, that there's *but one Text*
in the Bible, or that every Text speaks but one thing ; which
 one shall be apt to think, if he goes to the most of the
 Churches in Town, that ever you was at, you mean ; this
 indeed is such a Grievance, as may deserve the considera-
 tion of a Committee of Parliament ; so we'll ev'n adjourn
 it till the next Sessions. The next thing you make free
 with, is Doctor Sacheverell's Probity, and there in-
 deed, I fear, I'm not upon the level with you : I never
 had the Happiness of his Acquaintance, or ever did my
 self the Honour so much as of an impertinent visit to him,
 so can't pretend to say, how far he deals in mental Excep-
 tions or Reservations in his private Conversation : But in
 that of his publick, notwithstanding your Story, that he
 sent to Oxon for, and was denied a Testimonial of his
 Loyalty and good Behaviour, which is perfectly false ; and
 though 'tis suppos'd, the Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry
 absented himself from the House, as apprehending he
 should be called upon to give a Character of him, which
 'tis believ'd, would have made out his criminal Inten-
 tion ; notwithstanding this supposition and belief, intire-
 ly of your own making, and your unmannerly and
 uncharitable Reflexion, p. 35, he appears in my Eye,
 still to be a Man of Probity and Integrity. But
 you, I know, have always Proofs, Proofs cut and dry'd,
 ready to make out any thing ; and when all is said and
 done, these are the best Arguments which a Man may enter
 down in his Common-place for the serving all Occasions,
 such as are contain'd in or may be deduc'd from the
 following Propositions. *Several Gentlemen, who had before*
refus'd the Oaths to qualify themselves for the Commission of
Lieutenancy and Peace, did afterwards, with Dispensations
for that Purpose, take the Oaths to sit in the House of Com-
mons ;

mons ; and some Clergymen, at first Nonjurors, have now with proper Instructions taken the Oaths. Copies of these Dispen-
 sations and Instructions I suppose you may have under Lock
 and Key ; for Originals, unless they be Contracts, I know you
 don't value ; but these being neither prov'd nor produc'd,
 for the present must be set aside : And from the Residue
 of the Premises don't it most easily and naturally follow,
 that a Seat in the House of Commons is much more de-
 sirable than a Commission to be a Depury-Lieutenant or
 a Justice of Peace, and that a Living of a Hundred *per An-*
num is a much more comfortable Thing for the Mainte-
 nance of a Clergy-man and his Family than nothing ? These
 Propositions, if rightly order'd, and put into the Hands of
 a Reader of common Honesty and common Understanding,
 will certainly demonstrate that good Roast Beef and Cla-
 ret is a more agreeable Sustenance than Small-Beer and
 Bread and Butter, and that Turneps with Butter to 'em,
 eat more favourably than withour. But the Consequence
 you draw : That these Gentlemen and Clergy, notwith-
 standing their Oaths to the Queen and Government, are
 labouring the Subversion and Ruin of both ; that notwith-
 standing their Abjuration of the Pretender, they are con-
 triving and carrying on his Service and Interest instead
 of Her Majesty's ; that is, that they are the worst of Rogues
 and Villains ; and that because some Men are Villains, which
 remains still to be prov'd, therefore Dr. Sacheverell is so
 too ; and, when your Hand was in, you might have added,
 because the King of France is a Knave and a Tyrant, there-
 fore all the Princes in Europe are so ; this is a Consequence
 most absurd in Reason, and in Charity most unchristian
 and inhuman ; so I leave it to the Reader to determine who
 has most occasion for the Prayers of the Church. —

ARTICLE the Second.

IF I mistake not, Sir, the Managers for the Honourable the House of Commons branch'd out the Charge exhibited against the Doctor in this Article into Five or Six Particulars; and if I am mistaken, the Charge will soon bring me under Correction; and yet you, forgetful of the Duty you owe to your Country, of the Gentlemen whom you represent, and those whom you undertake to vindicate, omit on this Head several of those Particulars, and leave the Gentlemen Managers as to those, to stand or fall by their own Arguments: We are at our Liberty then, I presume, without any Offence to you, Sir, to join with the Doctor, That these Parts of his Charge are made out by Intendments, unnecessary Implications, and strain'd Constructions, by piecing broken Sentences, and conjoining distant and independent Passages; and without Offence to the Gentlemen Managers we may say, That the Aspersions as to these stands unwip'd off by your Vindication: Under this Head, that of the Toleration, the first Charge, (and I believe the only one) you alledge against the Doctor is, *That among the false Brethren to God, Religion, or the Church, he comprehends those who defend the Toleration and Liberty of Conscience*; and lest you should be guilty of too much Civility, you leave out his next Words, and under Pretence of Moderation excuse the Separation, and lay the Fault on the true Sons of the Church for carrying Matters too high. This Charge indeed you don't make good by joining distant and independent Passages, of that I must acquit you, but you do it, if my Senses don't totally deceive me, by disjoining entire Sentences; for those who defend Toleration, and excuse the Separation, by laying the Fault on the Sons of the Church, are mention'd in one and the same Sentence, and included under the same Character of false Brethren. I'm sure the Doctor tells us in his Sermon, that he did not mean to reflect on the Toleration or Indulgence by Law allow'd, p. 20. *I would not be understood as if I intended to cast the least invidious Reflection on that Indulgence which the Government has condescended to give the Dissenters, which I'm sure all those who wish well to our Church are ready to grant to Consciences truly scrupulous, let them enjoy it in the full Limits the Law has prescrib'd.* This he says again in his Answer to the Articles, and repeats again in his Speech; but if you deny him the common Liberty of interpreting the Sense of his own Words, and persist obstinately in it, that this must

not nor shall be his meaning; in short, that he don't know himself what was his own meaning, we can't conclude any thing less than that he's to be comprehended amongst those who don't wish well to our Church; for those who do wish well he says are ready to grant this legal Exemption to Consciences truly scrupulous, and for defending Toleration and Liberty of Conscience, which he does in his Sermon, Answer and Speech, provided it be in the Method the Law has prescrib'd, we must e'en put him down in the Number of false Brethren. I find, Sir, you are not pleas'd with his Distinction and Reflections on the Word *Toleration*, to which I say this: If the Dissenters by those blind Guides their own Imaginations, or those more blind, (if not wicked) Guides, their Teachers, have been deluded into a Notion that the Toleration is an Establishment, and that the Act of Parliament which allows their Way of Worship, with certain Qualifications, and under Restrictions, sets them on the same Foot with the People of the Church of *England*, which is notoriously known to be the Opinion of some amongst them; and if they live and act according to that Perswasion, 'tis high Time they should be inform'd what is and what is not the meaning of the Act; and if they think by Toleration is meant an Establishment, it can't be unreasonable to exchange in common Usage, if possible, that Term for another, one which mayn't be so much liable to that Interpretation, and which at least will cut out new Work for their Preachers to seduce their Followers into these Errors and Mistakes; and if the Separatists, under Colour of this Act of Parliament, whether we call it the Toleration, Indulgence, or Exemption-Act, amongst those who understand the Force of it, matters not, if they think that they are excus'd from that abominable Sin, the Sin of rending and dividing the Church of Christ, and take themselves to be at Liberty to join or not to join with us in our Communion as their Occasions and their Interest require, which is daily practis'd, I wish I could say not so daily excus'd; for my part I can't think it a Breach of the most Christian Vertues of Charity and Moderation to lay before 'em, That the Law on which they depend does exempt 'em only from the Penalties of former Human Laws, and not from the damnable Sin of Schism, and by persuasive Arguments, and such only as will damage neither their Bodies or Estates, to draw them from the Evil of their Ways; so far am I from thinking this a Breach, that I fear those (if any such there be) are guilty of the Breach of both, and of the Damnation of many a Soul, who flatter them in their Courses, or avoid all Opportunities of reprov'ing them, at least they have

Have forfeited (in my Opinion I mean) all Pretences to that Love for and Esteem of our Stablish'd Church, which it most justly challenges from all, and from its true Sons justly receives. And if some Persons, under Pretence of dissenting from the Church of *England*, take a License to absent from all Assemblies whatsoever for the religious Worship of God, as the manner of some is, no harmless and well-meaning Dissenter can quarrel that such Hypocrites, such Despisers of God and all Religion, are severely lash'd and censur'd, even to Anathema's, as having no Title to the Indulgence by this Act intended; for the scandalous Actions indeed of these Wretches, the Dissenters themselves (unless they abett and encourage 'em) are by no means answerable; but if they, or some amongst 'em, do stretch the Law beyond the true Intention of the Makers of it, by Erection of Seminaries, and the like, and interpret it so far in their Favour, as to contend with the Church for the Right of Stablishment, which is more surely than the Government design'd; such Usage certainly all true Lovers of our Constitution in Church and State must and will resent, so far forth as to reduce, in a proper Season, the Law within its intended Limits; and that I'm sure may be done with such a Temper, that no Conscience truly scrupulous, and nothing else, shall have any Reason to complain of hard Measure, or shall need to be under any Apprehension that the Liberty of Conscience indulg'd to them by that Act of Grace shall be taken from 'em. In p. 24. you are very angry with the Doctor for the Warmth and Severity of Expression which he uses towards the Dissenters, for which, tho' it were granted that he had no Provocation at all to use 'em, I think he has given a sufficient Account, such an Account as you would be very unwilling to undergo, notwithstanding your great Abilities, for associating him, p. 23. with *Jacobites, Papists, Juring, Non-juring, and (the worst of) abjuring Clergy*, and then leaving him under a State of Reprobation. To which I shall only add, That the greatest Piece of Justice you can do the Doctor and your Self is, to take your own Reproof back, and where you find Occasion, to apply it; but don't let us therefore impeach a Man of high Crimes and Misdemeanors. What you muster up farther on this Article is but tittle-tattle Stuff, and affects the Doctor no more than the Old Story of a Cock and a Bull, or the new one of the Emperor of the *Mohocks* and his Companions. In your long Encomiums, for Instance, on the Dissenters Behaviour during the late Disturbances, I don't conceive how he is concern'd, unless it were that he should be as glad as you (for so I'm sure he would be)

to find them verify'd in all Circumstances. And pray how is your History of the Project of Comprehension to the Purpose, or that of a Reconciliation with the *Gallican Church*, which, by the by, has been well answer'd by a Clergy-man, one of the most high-flying sort of all? And what Connexion is there between your one Secret which you tell the Doctor, That Mr. *Burton* lost his Ears in haughty *Laud's* Days, or those Twenty others which you have in your Pocket, and the Impeachment of Dr. *Sacheverell* of high Crimes and Misdemeanors, for harsh Language against the Dissenters, and for his Reproofs of such Brethren as are false, unless it be the same thing for one Man to lose his Ears for being a false Brother, and for another to be impeach'd for pointing out and warning us against such Wolves in Sheeps Cloathing? Well, I find to maintain Toleration universally, and in the greatest Latitude, and to prosecute a Man for not using the Word with Veneration, to commend the Dissenters, and tell all the nasty Stories of those of the Church of *England*, to laugh at and ridicule her, the Church's Ordinances and Powers, and to call her Ministers *high-flying Ambassadors with too little Grace, Mercy and Charity*; this is the most infallible Sign and Characteristick of a true Son of the Church, and the most undeniable Method to promote her Interest; so I submit.

ARTICLE the Third.

IN the Third Article, the Danger of the Church, you fall foul on the Doctor for remembring us, as he does in his Sermon at St. Paul's, *That King Charles the First his Person was voted to be out of Danger at the same time that his Murderers were conspiring his Death.* The Truth and Justness of the Observation I think you admit, but your Complaint is, *That he intended to insinuate, That the Members of both Houses of Parliament which sat in 1705, and pass'd a Vote resolving that the Church of England was out of Danger, were then conspiring its Ruin.* In order to satisfy us that none of those Gentlemen who sat then in Parliament, some of which you know dissented from that Vote, possibly from a Consciousness of the Mischief they intended to the Church, and that no Persons, either within St. Stephen's Chapel or without, were then contriving and labouring the Subversion of our Episcopal Government, that there, tho' it might be of Service, and would be

be acceptable News, you take no care of, but only comfort up those Gentlemen and your self that 'tis but *consequential Scandal*; that *the Comparison, when examin'd, does not run on all four*; that a thin House of Commons differs from a full one, and that a difference don't make it cease to be the same. 'Tis an Old Saying, you know, That he who takes a scandalous Reflexion makes it, specially if it happens to be consequential only, and lame of one Leg, or so; but you, not regarding what the Doctor has said, That he drew no Parallel between the Two Votes, and that the Parallel would not hold, the Vote about King *Charles* being made by both Houses of Parliament, and the Murder of him contriv'd and committed by the House of Commons only, and but a small Remnant of them neither, yet you are resolv'd that the Application must and shall do; and so let that pass. The next grand Observation you make is, That *the great Design of the Sermon (preach'd at St. Paul's) was to undermine Her Majesty's Title to the Crown*. To have found out that a Person who allows the *Desacrosity* of the Queen, and preaches up Her Hereditary Right, devolv'd upon Her from Her Royal Ancestors; that *Slip-knot of Hereditary Right*, and talks of unconditional and unlimited Obedience and Non-resistance to the Supreme Powers that be, that such a Preacher should at the same time and by those Doctrines have a Design against Her Majesty's Person and Government, is a Discovery which a Man of ordinary Sagacity might make; but when a Man is telling the Lord-Mayor of London and his Congregation at St. Paul's, that Atheism, Profaneness and Immorality, walk up and down triumphantly, and that heretical, blasphemous, seditious and antimonarchical Notions are printed, publish'd, and universally dispers'd throughout the Kingdom with Impunity, then to be able to smell out Gunpowder and Matches to undermine Her Majesty's Title, and to blow up both Houses of Parliament, that's such a Master-piece in the Science of discovering the hidden Works of Darkeness, as plainly shews the incomparable Brightness of a Man's Parts, and the invaluable Blessings of a quick and happy Nose. I have heard it observ'd long before the Sermon at St. Paul's, That the Deluge of abominable Vices, and that Licentiousness in Principles and Practices, which by the Negligence and Remissness of inferior Magistrates has of late Years overspread this Land, might some time or other disturb the Peace and Quiet of the Nation, and bring down God's Vengeance on Church and State; but that the Prevention of these Impieties and Enormities, and a Stoppage of the further Growth of these Mischiefs, and an Exhortation from the Pulpit to those

those in Authority to put the Laws in Execution for that Purpose, should be the Occasion of subverting Her Majesty's Government and undermining Her Title, that is to suppose Her Majesty's Welfare and the Happiness of these Kingdoms to be grounded on such a Foundation as all good Men, who wish well to Church and State, have reason to pray God, out of his infinite Goodness, to deliver us from. The next Matter you take notice of is, p. 28. what the Doctor alleges in Maintenance of his former Assertion, That the Church is in Danger, tho' not from Her Majesty's Administration, yet from the general Lewdness and Corruption of the Age; and this he presses from the Atheism, Hypocrisy and Irreligion, so openly and impudently profess'd amongst us, and from those outrageous Blasphemies against God and all Religion, Natural as well as Reveal'd, vented publickly with Impunity, of which he produc'd a large and dismal Collection. In answer to this you ask, *if we, consider'd as a Church, are not, even now, the very Pride and Boast of the Reformation, the main Strength and Bulwark against Popery; consider'd as a People, the Head of the united Body of Christendom?* Yes, Sir, from whence, and because there are, besides the Doctor, some pious and good Men in the Nation, who follow that great Example of Piety, that burning and shining Light amidst a crooked and perverse Generation, our most Excellent Queen; from thence I suppose it follows that no atheistical, irreligious and rebellious Principles are propagated among us, no heterodox Opinions or damnable Heresies are encourag'd, and in short, that all Debaucheries of all kinds are remov'd far out of our Land: This is but a melancholy Topick to insist on, and may give Occasion to the Adversaries of our Church and Nation to rejoice, so we'll wave that, and let every one of us rather turn our selves from the Evil of our Ways, for that's the most effectual Method to prevent that Divine Vengeance which a wicked and sinful People have but too just Reason to dread and expect. A second Proof of the Corruption of the Age, and consequently of the Danger of the Church, is the Doctor's godly Collection, as you call it, in which, as you reckon 'em up, his Managers have Recourse to *Hickeringill, Asgill, Toland, Gildon, and Tuchin*. Upon this Head you are something on the pleasant, and here the Doctor has learn'd of Mr. *Tarter*, to engage with the dangerous Shadows of the Church's Enemies, chalk'd out on the Wall; and this you undertake to prove, which is always the spoiling of good Things; and having drawn your *Toledo Trusty*, and put your self into a proper Posture of Defence, you attack him thus. *But the Managers at Tom's say, that*

all

all the Passages quoted out of the Collection to make out the present Danger of the Church prove no new Danger of the Church since the passing the Vote in 1705, because all those Books were wrote and printed long before 1705; and they shew that the Administration has been so vigilant that the Books and their Authors have been all censur'd and punish'd. Here, Sir, by the Excess of your Civility to the Gentlemen at Tom's, have you run your self into an unhappy Dilemma, for either you are engaging the dangerous Shadows of your Enemies chalk'd out on the Wall, a mean Operation for a Man of your Abilities, or you are guilty of asserting a notorious Untruth. When you say that all those Books were wrote and printed long before 1705, if by that you mean those, and only those Books, a Catalogue of the Names of the Authors of which you just now gave us, *Hickeringill, Asgill, Toland, &c.* I believe 'tis true that all those Books were printed before 1705, but then, Sir, you are fighting with imaginary Enemies of your own chalking out on the Wall, at least you have chalk'd out just so many Enemies as you had occasion for, or you thought you could conveniently deal withal; and 'tis an undeniable Truth that the Church is in no new Danger from those Enemies who at the time of the Vote were in being, and by that were resolv'd to be no Enemies, or not to be of any Significance; but if you mean that all the Books out of which the Doctor's Collection is drawn were wrote and printed long before the Year 1705, which you must mean if you are arguing against the Doctor, and not your self only, then I fear you are guilty of an untrue Assertion, for Mr. Clendon's Book with its Dedications I'm sure was printed, whensoever it was wrote, since that time, and I have some reason to think, from that very Vote one might reasonably think, that *The Rights of the Christian Church* was not printed long before 1705, and this Book I'm sure was not out of your Thoughts, for p. 30. you take notice of it as burn'd by the Order of the House of Commons, with this proper Advertisement, *for one unwary Passage.* Now I suppose from these Books, and some others which have been printed since the Time of that Vote, and from the daily Labours of the *Observer* and *Review*, which you don't deny in some Instances to reflect on the Queen, State, and the Ministry, 'tis not unlawful to conclude that the Church and State may be in some Danger now, tho' not a new one; for that implies a Danger before, notwithstanding and without Reflection on that Vote of Parliament. Much after the same rate you shew the Vigilance of the Administration in censuring these Books and punishing the Authors, by which I mean not to insinuate any want of Wisdom or Industry in those in
the

the Administration in this or any other Respect, but only to shew you that you have no reason to expect, or they much reason to give you, any great matter of Thanks for the Service you have done 'em. For Instance, *Hickeringill, that Billingsgate Logician, that abominable Brute*, was prosecuted by the Bishop of London his Diocesan, very justly it seems, being one of the *blaspheming Highflyers*, to his Damage of 20000 l. and Mr. *Asgill, for a Maggot*, has been turn'd out of the House of Commons both in *England and Ireland*, you should have inserted by the Ministry; and Mr. *Blunt*, who is added to the former List, *has already accounted to God for his Errors*; therefore the Administration is very vigilant: but our Old Politician Mr. *Tuchin* was prosecuted in *Westminster-Hall*, and would certainly have been punish'd if he had not escap'd, by the *Laziness of the then Attorney-General*; Oh! the Vigilance of some Ministers during this Queen's Reign; and poor Poet *Gildon* by long Imprisonments he's half starv'd, and something more; but Mr. *Toland* his Punishment or the Censure of his Works (for a private Reason, known only to Convocation Men or so) is quite forgot, unless you design that pretty little Name of *atheistical Vagabond* to be his Punishment; and that we are to suppose that you are one of that Administration whose Vigilance you are commending. At last, after all this great Noise and Outcry, whether Danger or no Danger to the Church, after much of Paper wasted and Ink destroy'd *pro and con*, you tell us, p. 30. *If the Doctor had been sincere enough to have pointed to the real Danger of the Church, he should not have forgot Mr. Dodwell's Book about the natural Mortality of the Soul, &c.* And if he had been wise enough to have put the Care of making this Collection into your Hands, you had certainly been able to have prov'd the Church in real Danger; and on another Occasion, (if any should be) your Abilities and Industry, and your present Service, won't be forgot, I do suppose. Well then, let the Danger to the Church arise from what Quarters soever, from profess'd Enemies or pretended Friends, from open and undisguis'd Separatists of any Sect or Party, or false Brethren, we have now sufficient Warning given us, and we must take the Blame to our selves, and great will the Blame be, if we don't continue the Glory of the Reformation and the Head of the Protestant Interest both in Church and State, which we can promise our selves to be no longer than whilst we maintain and preserve our most Primitive and Apostolical Church, the Church of *England* as by Law establish'd.

ARTICLE the Fourth.

ON the Fourth Article the Managers at Tom's pretend to make out the first part of the Charge out of the Doctor's own Words, which I perceive causes much of Joy, and affords solid Comfort. In p. 15. he affirms, *That there are false Brethren in Church and State, who do weaken and undermine, and betray in themselves, and encourage and put it in the Power of our profess'd Enemies to overturn and destroy the Constitution of both.* I know no difference between you here, but that this Affirmation, then made by him, was printed for Henry Clements at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1709, and now 'tis printed and to be sold by A. Baldwin in Warwick-lane, 1710. For he says in his Answer to the Articles of Impeachment, if my Translation from the *Leyden Gazette* be just, That if he had suggested that there are Persons in Church and State to whom the Denomination of false Brethren, in some one or more Senses of that Word, as by him interpreted, does belong, he humbly conceives such Suggestions would not be deem'd false, malicious, or highly criminal. But the great Contention between you is, whether the Doctor don't intend to include Men of Character and Station in this Reflection? And great Heats there are and Animosities in disputing to what Offices these Appellations may be properly given; but, without determining this Point, for no Body would submit to yours or my Determination when made, every one taking a Liberty to judge for himself, I shall only attempt to shew that you have not made good your Allegation. The Proof of this you draw from a Paragraph in the Sermon, p. 22. wherein the Doctor says, *That as to false Brotherhood in regard to the World (or State) what a Scandal is it to see Men of Character and Stations shift and prevaricate with their Principles, and start from their Religion upon any Occasion of Difficulty or Trial?* That is, in one place he speaks of weakening and undermining, and betraying Church and State, p. 15. and in p. 22. he is speaking of those who prevaricate with their Principles and start from their Religion, one an Offence committed in a publick, the other in a private Capacity; therefore in both places he means the same Persons. But with your Leave, Sir, in p. 15. under the general Head of the Peril to Church and State from false Brethren, he mentions those only who weaken and destroy or betray the Constitution in both; and under the particular Heads from that general one he is not charg'd (by you I mean) with any Reflection or Insinuation on Men of Character and Stations; and in p. 21. entering on the general Head, *Of the enormous Guilt and Folly of false Brotherhood*, an Head widely different from and independent on the other, he says on the particular Head,

Head of false Brotherhood in regard to the World, (or all good Christians, for 'tis Nonsense to say, or the State) 'tis a vast Scandal to see Men of Character and Stations to shift their Principles and start from their Religion; and under this Head you don't prove that he speaks of weak'ning and betraying the Constitution: From thence I infer, That where he speaks of weakening, undermining and betraying the Constitution, he does not mean to include Men of Character and Stations; and where he mentions Men of Characters and Stations, he does not intend to affirm that they weaken, undermine and betray the Constitution. But lest the Doctor, his Council, and Managers, should not be able to do the Business, you are pleas'd to come into his Assistance; you tell us, p 35. there be some Gentlemen who pretend to know the Man and his meaning, and who have a Key to his Men of Character and Stations, that affirm that he has expressly nam'd one Minister in this so much controverted Page 22; from whence I conceive we may conclude, if he expressly nam'd one Minister as a false Brother, that he did not name Twenty, and whether he call'd him Shifter, Prevaricator, Underminer, or Betrayers; that he could mean no more than one by his expressly naming but one. But this Argument I confess, tho' it concludes right, don't prove very much, because the Premises are not true, for the Doctor has not expressly nam'd any Minister, according to the common Acceptation of those Words, of which you can't but be sensible your self; for you say some Gentlemen pretend to know his meaning, that is, pretend to know the Name of a Man who is expressly nam'd, and have a Key to his Men of Character and Stations, to open what was wide open before. But supposing the Character there is applicable, or the Appellation sometimes given, to any one Minister, I don't say 'tis true, or was intended by him, does it follow because a Man is a Scandal to Men of Piety and Integrity, if he were so, therefore he can and will undermine and weaken the Constitution in Church and State? Or can we suppose that any single Minister, tho' in never so high a Station and Character, has in himself so much Influence or Authority as to be able to put it in the Power of our profess'd Enemies to overturn and destroy the Establishment both Ecclesiastical and Civil? If you are perverse, and will suppose such a thing is possible, I must e'en leave it to your own Comment, to put upon it what Construction you please. You proceed, and charge the Doctor with Reflections on Her Majesty's Ecclesiastical Ministers, as you call 'em, the Bishops; but having examin'd the Passages you quote, I find my self more confirm'd in the same Opinion of which I was before, more fully satisfy'd that he design'd no such Matter. In the Dedic-

tion to his Sermon at St. Paul's he does indeed say, *That the Church is vigorously attack'd from without, which can never be meant of those of or within the Church, tho' it were suppos'd they were false Brethren; and that 'tis lazily defended from within; but there the Bishops can't be meant neither, unless they are Justices of Peace, Aldermen and Common-Council-men of the City of London; for he's speaking of the many honest and well-affected Gentlemen in the City, reproving 'em for want of Courage, or want of Sense of the dangerous Attempts of the Enemies, and is not by him apply'd, or in any wise more applicable to them, the Bishops, than 'tis to the Mayor of Queenborough or the Constables of Ailsbury. That the Church is to encounter not only the open Fury and Violence of her profess'd Enemies, but is to be betray'd and given up by her own false-hearted and insidious Apostles, is by the Doctor mention'd as the Case of the Universal Church of Christ, as the sad Legacy bequeath'd by our Saviour to his Disciples and the Church Militant; and he adds, That the Histories of the Church in all Ages are as 'twere but one continu'd Ratification of this melancholy Truth, and instances at large in the Age of St. Paul; now to interpret this as an Affront design'd to the Prelates of the present Age is, I humbly conceive, to strain for an ill-natur'd Construction. The last passage you quote, is in St. Paul's Sermon, p. 15. *Such is the hard Fortune of the Church, her worst Adversaries must be let into her Bowels, under the holy Umbrage of Sons; who neither believe her Faith, own her Mission, submit to her Discipline, or comply with her Liturgy; by which Sentence, as it stands unconnected, with what goes before, and what comes after; one would think, that the Bishops had enter'd into a Confederacy to admit all the dissenting Cobblers and Tinkers in England, into holy Orders: But when I found the place, I perceiv'd the Preacher was speaking of an universal Comprehension or Coalition, and he tells us, that would be the Effect and Consequence of such a project, or it would have none at all; and if so, I cannot but agree with the Doctor, that the Fortune of the Church in such a Case would be very hard. And since you were sensible enough, that the Doctor was talking of this Comprehension Project (as appears by your quoting, p. 25. this place for that very purpose) you should have been so ingenuous too, as to have directed us to the Page, and informed us what the Subject was, and it would not have been from the purpose, or any derogation to your Honour, to have taken notice of it as an Objection; for 'tis no so inconsiderable an one; and if you had satisfied the World, that the consequence which the Doctor charges upon it would not have followed, it would have been some Vindication of the Pro-**

movers of it, Gentlemen, whom you have a tender regard
 for; and possibly some small matter of Recommendation of
 it for the future. In the next Page, p. 34. You are pleased,
 out of the abundance of your Complaisance to the Doctor, to
 offer your endeavours to prove, that he did not design to
 defame Her Majesty's Ministers, either Ecclesiastical or Ci-
 vil; that he has said and printed so many respectful Expres-
 sions, and paid so many Compliments to the Ministry, that
 nothing can be given in Evidence on the other side, equiva-
 lent to those publick Demonstrations; That is, as you say,
he has commended the Ministry in 1702. (as he did in his
Sermon by him quoted,) therefore he ought not to be charg'd
with defaming the Ministry in 1710. This indeed, if he us'd
 it thus were a notable Argument; but I observe, that your
 Answer has much the same fault, as his supposed Argument;
 for in his Speech he produces that Sermon, and the Dutiful
 and Loyal expressions in it, to show his true Zeal and Affe-
 ction to Her Majesty's Person and Government, and not that
 to the Ministry; which is so plain, as nothing can be more,
 unless he had declared it in so many Words, that he did
 not intend thereby to show his Affection to the Ministry:
 Your Answer to which is, that a Commendation of the Mi-
 nistry in 1702. is no Commendation of the Ministry in
 1710. and mine to you is, an Affection to the Queen, is no
 Affection to Her Ministers, either in 1702, or 1710. But
 by the next Paragraph you would perswade us, that he not
 only says, that he intended no Reflexion on the Ministry,
 but that he says it and swears it; for there, after lifting up
 his Hands and Eyes to Heaven, you say, *he appeals to the*
dreadful Tribunal, at which he and all the World are to be
judg'd: He calls the searcher of Hearts to Witness, in the most
solemn and religious manner, that he was innocent of any de-
sign to defame the Queen's Administration or Ministry. This
 Asseveration, you tell us, *work'd so strong upon you, that your*
Charity has blinded your Senses, and makes you pray for his
Soul's sake, that he spoke nothing but the Truth, of which
 you are very Suspicious, and believe he has expressly nam'd
 one Minister. I have been told, that Charity obliges a Man
 to interpret with Candour, to judge with Favour, and in
 compassion to forgive; but that it should ever blind a Man's
 Senses, is a Notion new to me; and though it may be com-
 mendable to see, and to be able to forgive, yet surely, not
 to see when one's Elind, is no great Indication of Virtue;
 but to be sure, when a Man is Blind, (though it were be-
 cause he won't see, and not because he can't,) 'tis giving it
 the best colour to lay the fault on his Charity. But that
 you who were sensible, that this Appeal was made before a
 venerable Assembly. and with many religious Circumstances,

that

that it was pronounced with Vehemence, and the sincere Behaviour of a Christian, should not yet have Faith enough to believe him; that you, whose Senses were blinded with Charity, should give your self (a blind Man) the trouble of inquiring, and be able to see, that he had expressly nam'd one Minister; that you, who were at Prayers for his Soul's sake, should have the Curiosity to find out what would turn to the Damnation of it; this must cause much surprize: But 'tis cause of much more, that to the Doctor's Words, *I had no design to defame Her Majesty's Administration*, you should add the Words *or Ministry*; when it appears plainly by the different Characters, in which the last Words are Printed, that you were not insensible that he never used these Words; but your excuse, I suppose is, your Charity had blinded your Senses, and your Prayers your Understanding. And your Addition of the Word *Ministry*, does not effectually do the business neither; for by Her Majesty's Administration or Ministry (if that Word be added) is not meant the same thing, as by the Words, *Her Majesty's Ministers or the Ministry*; for by the one is commonly understood those things, which she does by Herself, or in her own Person, and by t'other is meant, the Persons of those imploy'd under Her Majesty; so you ought at least to have added the Word *the* to the Word *Ministry*, before the Expression comes up to the Sense you would have it speak. But tho' the Word were capable of this Construction, or sometimes used or understood in this Sense; yet whoever will give himself the trouble to consult the whole Paragraph, p. 7. in the *Folio Edition*, where he's speaking of his Thoughts and Intentions, and in which he makes this solemn appeal to God, may see with a running Eye (I'm sure I did at the first reading,) that by these Words, *Her Majesty's Administration (or Ministry if you please)* he meant not to say *Her Majesty's Ministers or the Ministry*. After these Words he adds *nor to infuse any undutiful thought of HER; I not only pay HER all Honour and Obedience, but am from the bottom of my Soul zealously and affectionate'y Loyal to HER, being entirely perswaded, that the Church is in no Danger from HER; that SHE is heartily affected to its Establishment and Prosperity*. Nay, so studiously does he seem to have avoided speaking of the Ministry throughout his Speech, that the Sum total of what he says on that Head, is in p. 5. *what Minister of State, I beseech your Lordships, have I been PROV'D TO REFLECT ON DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY?* Upon the whole we must conclude, that here the Doctor is *made to speak*, and in the most solemn manner, and religiously by an Oath, *what he never thought of*. The latter part of this Article, which charges him with keeping up Distinction of Factions and

and Parties, you attempt to make good against the Doctor, from the Dedication to the Derby Sermon; for which purpose you cite almost the whole of it; but the most displeasing Passages are, *that the Principles of our Church and Constitution are shamefully Betray'd, and run down with secret Malice, and open Violence; that there be still amongst us, those who have courage to speak it, as well as those who have Lives and Fortunes to maintain it; who scorn to sit silently by, and partake in the Sins of these associated Malignants.* This being told from the Pulpit, is to instill Fears and Jealousies into weak Minds; I suppose you mean, into the weak Minds of the Gentlemen of the Grand-Jury at Derby; for it may not be improper perhaps to inform you, that the Clergy don't use to deliver their Dedications from the Pulpit to the People, whatever may be the practice in a Conventicle. This is blowing the Trumpet, and mustering the Forces; and these Gentlemen, I presume, were all to have Commissions, and his Cousin Sacheverell to be Generalissimo; but they it seems had not their Lives and Fortunes ready to maintain the Church, when their Brethren the Gentry of White-fryars were setting up the Standard; they for want of Courage, or their Commissions, or something else, sat silently by, and partook in the Sins of associated Malignants. This is dividing the People by Distinctions, and pointing to them; Yes, most certainly, the Dissenters go to a Barn, and those of the National Religion go to a Steeple-House; but the Minister for the benefit of his dull and unapprehensive Congregation, may surely inform 'em, that his Parishioners who are gone to a Meeting, are not amongst 'em in the Church, and that those who are separated from 'em, are not with 'em; but to point to 'em, and to say, that a Neighbour who goes to a Conventicle, or under pretence of it, never stirs out of his Chimney Corner, is not a Well-wisher to the Church of England; and to intimate that such an one, whether Justice of Peace, or Alderman, who goes to the Church in the Morning, and receives the Holy Communion there, and in the Afternoon slides into, and makes one of B---s Assembly is a False-Brother, this is an unpardonable Crime. And besides this, that he should excite and stir up Her Majesty's good Subjects of the County of Derby to Arms in August, should direct them the Grand-Jury, by a Sermon in November at St. Paul's to the Enemy, by pointing out to the associated Malignants, calling the Dissenters Church-devouring Malignants; and that in March, the Gentry of White-fryars should rise and pull down the Edifices of these Malignants, have all such a Connexion, that one was the immediate consequence of, and from the other. What was the Cause of the late Insurrection or Rebellion, and of what it was the consequence, I find the World are

not yet agreed in, and 'tis not necessary for me here to say, or guess what was the Cause, and if it were, my ignorance of, or any disability in me to shew the true Cause, will never prove that to be the Cause which you assign, for my dulness or your sagacity will be of small consideration here; but 'tis enough for the present purpose to say, and that I may safely with Truth and without Offence say, that for the proving an Assertion in dispute between us, you are pleased to produce as an Argument, an Assertion equally if not more liable to dispute: To which I shall only add, that 'tis not reasonable to suppose, or ever will be supposed, that the Doctor and his Managers, who are so frequently (you say always) Preaching and Writing against it, should be great admirers or encouragers of a Mob-government, or Mob-reformation. As for the Doctor's misinterpretation or misapplication of Scripture, you refer us over to the excellent Speech of the Managers; insinuating only *en passant*, that not one Word has been suggested in his defence or excuse; *that he abuses it sometimes by adding, sometimes by leaving out Words and Sentences; sometimes he miscites, and always wickedly misapplies holy Writ.* This you pretend to no proof of here, I suppose, because you are not one of those *whose Profession or Studies qualify 'em to be competent Judges of such matters*; on which account, unless you have a wiser Reason yet undiscover'd, I think you would have shown much more of a Gentleman, and not less of a Christian to have spared your Language at the same time, that you wav'd your Arguments. But arguing is not here your business, and seldom or ever your Talent; for if 'twere, it would be of infinite Obligation to the World, and as much to the commendation of your Abilities, to show how the Doctor's Words and Assertions, in his Character of a *Low-Churchman*, (for you are pleased to father that Pamphlet upon him, I know not for what reason) tho' they were supposed to be as False and Scandalous as you represent 'em, or even wish 'em to be, can possibly render him guilty of High Crimes and Misdemeanors for what he preach'd in his Sermon at *St. Paul's*, and said in his Dedication to that at *Derby*. What your design was in those scurrilous Expressions, and nasty Names, which you disperse so liberally on the Doctor throughout this whole Pamphlet, and specially on this Head, that his whole Speech is false and evasive; without one sincere Tittle in it, that he has appealed to God in the most solemn and religious manner, once or twice in it to a notorious Falshood, that he is arriv'd to invincible Impudence, and Atheistical Presumption, in short, is an infinite Scandal to the Church, resembles the Heathen *Fuglers*, is an occasional *Abjuror*, and a disguis'd *Papist*; this I had much rather recommend to your own Conscience

to reflect on, than disturb my own charitable Disposition by thinking of, and foul my Paper by writing those Inferences, which there's but too just Provocation to make, and I'm sure a Man had need have a great share of Christian Temper to forbear making. Now if this harsh Language, to give it the softest Name, has been deserv'd by the Doctor, and those Reflections in p. 19, and 20, by those whom you are pleas'd to call his Managers; nay, though those Calumnies have been rais'd without just Grounds, since they are spread with Industry; I think you might easily satisfy your self in the Scruple you make, what the Addresses from that Party (as you call it) to the Queen do mean; for surely it was high time, more than high time, for Her Majesty to expect, and for them in a publick manner, to give Her fresh Assurances of their sincere Loyalty and Affection to Her Majesty's Person, of their true zeal for, and ever inviolable Duty to Her Authority and just Rights, and of their steady and firm Adherence to the Constitution both in Church and State as by Law Establish'd. And since we pretend, all of us equally, to have no other Contention amongst us, *than who shall exceed the other in contributing to advance the Queen's present Happiness, and secure the Protestant Succession*; let us contend with each other by our Principles and Practices (for that's the only way) to convince the World, that the Professions of our Mouths, are no other than the Sense of our Hearts; and since we would all be thought, each of us more than the other, zealous to promote the Queen's Wish, *for the uniting of the Minds of her Subjects*, I think, we can't do better, than immediately to put in practice the Advice, I should say Commands, of Her our most Gracious Sovereign, every Man to mind his own Business. And for the Preservation of our present Establishment, both Civil and Ecclesiastical, when we have us'd our best indeavours in our several Stations, and according to our Capacities; let us join in our Prayers to the Almighty, That he with his mighty Hand, and a stretched out Arm, would protect and defend Her most Sacred Majesty, the Delight of our Eyes, and the Joy of our Heart; and together with Her, our Church and State, from the Malice of secret Enemies, and the Violence of open Ones; that he would grant Her a long Life, and a prosperous Reign; and when She shall be remov'd far hence into Bliss Immortal, and shall be to us no more, that we and late Posterity may enjoy the Fruits of Her Labour, the quiet and peaceable Possession of our most invaluable Constitution both in Church and State.

F I N I S.

ry
s,
n
er
ic
d
e
es
d
in
ry
is
t,
-
s
o
n
s
y,
c-
t
d
s
is
;
e
g
r,
d
y
n
l,
-
r
d
t
r
n
n
-
o
e
l
h

